## COVINGTON & BURLING LLP

1201 PENNSYLVANIA AVENUE NW WASHINGTON WASHINGTON, DC 20004-2401 NEW YORK TEL 202.662.6000 SAN FRANCISCO FAX 202.662.6291 LONDON WWW.COV.COM

BRUSSELS

JONATHAN D. BLAKE TEL 202.662.5506 FAX 202.778.5506 JBLAKE@ COV.COM

February 8, 2008

Marlene H. Dortch, Secretary Federal Communications Commission 445 12th St., SW Washington, DC 20554

> Re: Notice of Ex Parte Communications

MB Docket No. 07-42

Dear Ms. Dortch:

On February 7, 2008, the undersigned on behalf of the NFL Network met with Catherine Bohigian, Chief of the Office of Strategic Planning and Policy Analysis, and Michelle Carey, Senior Legal Advisor to Chairman Martin, Media Issues, to discuss the program carriage aspect of the Commission's leased access and program carriage proceeding. On February 1, the Commission released its Order in this proceeding.

At the meeting, we discussed the next steps in this proceeding, likely timing considerations and the reasons why action on the issue of streamlining and expediting program access complaints was not included in the Order. We also mentioned the initial arbitration order in the TCR Sports Broadcasting Holding, L.L.P. case, copy attached.

Please direct any questions concerning this matter to the undersigned.

Sincerely.

Jonathan D. Blake Counsel to NFL Network

Inthe D. Slee

Catherine Bohigian CC: Michelle Carey

JEROME J. SUSSMAN, Arbitrator (State Bar No. 49220) 2 2001 Wilshire Boulevard Suite 300 3 Santa Monica, CA 90403 (310) 453-6200 4 5 6 BEFORE THE COMMERCIAL ARBITRATION TRIBUNAL 7 8 OF THE AMERICAN ARBITRATION ASSOCIATION 9 AAA CASE NO. 71 472 E 00697 07 In the Matter of the Arbitration between 10 TCR SPORTS BROADCASTING 11 HOLDING, L.L.P., INTERIM AWARD 12 Claimant. 13 and 14 TIME WARNER CABLE, INC., 15 Respondent. 16 17 I, THE UNDERSIGNED ARBITRATOR, having been duly designated in accordance with 18 the "Adelphia Order", as hereinafter defined, and having been duly sworn, and having read the 19 submissions of the Parties and duly heard the proofs and allegations of the Parties, do hereby 20 issue this INTERIM AWARD, as follows: 21 Pursuant to the Commercial Arbitration Rules of the American Arbitration Association, 22 a Hearing was held at the offices of Day, Pitney, LLP at One Canterbury Green, Stamford, Conn. 23 on December 17, 2007 at 9:00 AM before Arbitrator Jerome J. Sussman. Appearing for the 24 parties were David Frederick, as attorney for Claimant, and Jay Cohen, as attorney for 25 Respondent. Also present were numerous other executives of TCR Sports and of Time Warner 26 Cable ("Time Warner") as well as additional lawyers from the firms representing the Claimant and 27

the Respondent.

28

This arbitration is being held pursuant to the order adopted July 13, 2006 by the Federal Communications Commission ("FCC") in the "Adelphia Case" (MB Docket No. 05-192) (herein referred to as the "Adelphia Order"). In that Case, the FCC determined that it would permit Comcast and Time Warner to acquire certain cable television assets then owned by Adelphia Cable and that "To constrain Comcast's and Time Warner's ability to unlawfully refuse carriage to unaffiliated RSNs... an RSN ... denied carriage by Time Warner may submit its carriage claim to arbitration within 30 days after the denial of carriage...." Time Warner asserts that it did not "deny carriage" to Claimant within the meaning of this order, that TCR Sports is not an RSN, and that the claim was not brought within 30 days after the denial of carriage.

Both Claimant and Respondent agreed to waive the time limits on this proceeding that are set forth in the Adelphia Order and Appendices B and C thereto. They also elected to bifurcate the proceedings so that in the first phase the arbitrator was to determine if there had been discrimination by TWC against TCR Sports. If there had been such discrimination, the Parties would proceed to a second phase in which the arbitrator was to determine in a "best offer" arbitration which of the two Parties carriage offers should be effectuated. Appropriately, such an arbitration is generally referred to as a "baseball arbitration" because of its use to resolve baseball salary negotiations.

Both Claimant and Respondent were too cute by half in the maneuvering leading up to this arbitration. That said, I find as follows with respect to these three defenses:

1. "Denial of Carriage": In my view, this is the most difficult issue in this proceeding. Time Warner asserts that because it offered to carry TCR's Mid-Atlantic Sports Network (herein "MASN") on a digital tier there was no denial of carriage. Such a conclusion would elevate form over substance in this matter. Granted, carriage on a digital tier would make MASN's programming available to all those subscribers who can receive the digital signal. However, the evidence indicates that no more than 50% of Time Warner's subscribers in the affected area receive a digital tier of service. This means that under the Time Warner proposal, MASN would be carried to just 50% of Time Warner's potential audience. The evidence clearly indicates that Time Warner carries its own sports network as well as all or, or virtually all, RSNs in its territory

on an analog tier. This would leave MASN as the only RSN that is not available on an analog tier, and it therefore would be available to only 50% of the potential audience. This is exactly the kind of discrimination that I think the FCC intended to prevent. Accordingly, I find that TWC did deny carriage to TCR.

- 2. **Timeliness**: TWC asks that we hold Claimant to the position it took in a letter dated April 24, 2007 from David Frederick, counsel for Claimant, to Henk Brands, counsel for Time Warner, that "Claimant is treating Time Warner's actions as a denial of carriage under applicable statutes and FCC rules." However Mr. Brands promptly replied that this statement was "incorrect" and that "TWC was not aware that ... negotiations had reached an impasse or end." Thereafter, the Parties did negotiate for an additional two weeks through a meeting on May 7, 2007. Since Time Warner did not treat the negotiations as having ended in April but instead continued to meet with Claimant, I should not treat the facts differently than the Parties did. I find that negotiations ended on May 7, 2007 and that TCR Sports filed its claim on June 5, 2007, which is within the 30-day time period.
- 3. **Is MASN an RSN?** Appendix B to the Adelphia Order sets forth in paragraph A the following definition:

"Regional Sports Network" and "RSN" mean any non-broadcast video programming service that (1) provides live or same-day distribution within a limited geographic region of sporting events of a sports team that is a member of Major League Baseball, the National Basketball Association,... and (2) in any year carries a minimum of either 100 hours of programming that meets the criteria of subheading 1 or 10% of the regular season games of at least one sports team that meets the criteria of subheading 1."

Although TWC disputes the conclusion that MASN qualifies as an RSN, the evidence clearly and indisputably establishes that MASN provides live distribution within the Mid-Atlantic States of games of both the Washington Nationals and the Baltimore Orioles, which are both Major League baseball teams; that it carries all of the games of these teams; that these 300-plus games amount to significantly more than 100 hours of programming.

Thus, I find that MASN is a "regional sports network" within the meaning of the

## Adelphia Order.

ADDITIONAL FINDINGS OF FACT. Based on the evidence presented and the arguments of the Parties, I make the following additional findings of fact:

- 4. TWC had both motive and opportunity to discriminate against TCR. The motive comes from TWC's desire to protect and promote its own RSN–News 14 Carolina. While News 14 Carolina is primarily a broadcaster of news, it easily fits within the definition of an RSN set forth above since it provides live broadcast of 50 games of the Charlotte Bobcats, a National Basketball Association team, during each of the past two NBA seasons. Other potential motives also exist: The possibility that News 14–Carolina also wants to acquire added programming for itself including some or all of the Major League Baseball games now broadcast by MASN which would likely become available if MASN were squeezed out of business. While there is nothing in the record to suggest that this is so, the record does show that News 14–Carolina did acquire rights to the Bobcats broadcasts only after C-SET (Carolinas Sports and Entertainment Television) failed apparently because it was unable to secure carriage from TWC, the largest cable carrier in North Carolina. These facts suggest the possibility that TWC is hoping to repeat that scenario here and scoop up the rights to the Washington Nationals and the Baltimore Orioles if MASN is put out of business. By virtue of its dominant position in the North Carolina market place, TWC certainly had the opportunity to discriminate.
- 5. It is my conclusion that by failing to offer MASN the possibility of broadcast on an analog tier, while simultaneously distributing its own RSN and all or almost all other RSNs on analog tiers, TWC did discriminate against Claimant. I agree that TWC is entitled to substantial level of editorial discretion in determining what channels it will distribute and on what tiers, but that discretion must be exercised in good faith. Since MASN alone was singled out for broadcast on a digital tier, that discretion was abused, and I conclude that Time Warner exercised its discretion here with an intent to discriminate.

The conclusion that Time Warner deliberately discriminated against MASN is inescapable from the documents and testimony before me. It is also buttressed by the fact that there were never any real negotiations between the Parties over the carriage of MASN by TWC.

Had there been an intention on the part of TWC to make an agreement instead of merely posturing, an executive or attorney for TWC would have phoned or otherwise contacted a counterpart at MASN to arrange a meeting or conference call to figure out a way to put MASN on the air after receipt of a request for carriage. Instead, it appears that all of TWC's efforts went into figuring out ways to avoid putting MASN on the air. Thus, TWC routinely replied to MASN's requests for carriage by asserting that it was not possible to put MASN on an the much more widely available analog tier, but that they would be glad to discuss carriage on a digital tier. Such a digital tier was available to approximately one-half of all TWC subscribers in North Carolina, which was the area involved. Given the poor results for other RSN's that had been on digital tiers, neither MASN nor I should have considered that a good faith offer. In the absence of any good faith offer to put MASN on an analog tier on any terms or in any part of North Carolina at any time, I must conclude that there were never good faith negotiations between the Parties and that TWC intended to discriminate against MASN.

6. SECOND PHASE OF THE PROCEEDING. Since I have determined that TWC discriminated against TCR Sports, the parties are required to proceed to the second phase of this arbitration. Counsel will kindly determine their availabilities as well as the availability of any necessary witnesses so that counsel can have a scheduling conference call with the arbitrator in the next 10 days.

Dated: January 7, 2008

Jerome J. Sussman, Arbitrator